

Church has indeed, thank God, room for all parties, but the parties referred to all hold with tenacity every vital doctrine of Scripture, and differ only in what are in reality minor points. Not only have Churchmen discovered how broad the Church is even as broad as the Bible; but thoughtful Dissenters have at last found it out, and are eagerly pressing into a fold which limits thought only as the Bible limits it, which, as they are recognizing does not set up narrow human standards, but is as broad and as wide as God's Holy Word. What the Bible permits the Church does not inhibit; what it prohibits the Church firmly opposes. "Nothing worth fighting about!" Surely the *Christian World* has closed its eyes to what is going on every day around it or it would not have been guilty of insinuating such a charge against the Church. Does it not know that in all good works, in zeal, in adapting itself to the wants of men in order to plead with them in behalf of their souls, the Church occupies a remarkable position at the present time? That she is aglow with love and eagerness to bring Christ Jesus home to the sinner, and that even Dissenters and Romanists have been forced to recognize and admire the splendid work which she is now doing! Jesus Christ and Him crucified! is not that the message, and is she not compelling men and women to heed it by her burning zeal and love for souls? If ever there was a time when the charge of paralysis could be truthfully made against the Church that time is certainly not the present. No, Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians are being drawn in increasing numbers into her fold because of her increasing earnestness, and faithful upholding of the doctrines of the Bible, and whether the wish be father to the thought or not, the *Christian World* cannot hope, while such zeal and faith continue, to see as a reality its false assumption and altogether mistaken views respecting the Church of England.

THE OPIUM TRADE.

ONE of the greatest blots on England's escutcheon at the present day is the horrible opium traffic with China. The English and Indian Governments both encourage the growth of the poppy in India, and the sale of its product in immense quantities to the Chinese. The reason for this moral obliquity can only be found in the enormous revenue which it yields to India, as the traffic can be defended by no principle of true statesmanship. In the year 1781, foreign opium was a drug in the Chinese marts of trade, but since that period the importation of the vile narcotic has constantly increased until now over 100,000 chests are annually purchased. This yields a yearly revenue to the British Government of India of between forty and sixty millions of dollars. It is asserted, and very truthfully, that this does not represent the total quantity of opium consumed by the Chinese. The drug is also produced in considerable quantities in China, and this argument is gravely advanced as a reason in favour of our exportation of the narcotic! It is said the Chinese must have it, and we may as well supply it as any one else. Now it is well known that the Chinese Government has made the strongest possible protests against the importation of what is pronounced, on all hands, a deadly and dangerous poison. The traffic is not only continued however, but it is forced upon the Chinese at the point of the bayonet, solely for the sake of the Indian exchequer which, year by year, as we have said, derives some sixty millions of dollars from this source.

It may well be asked with wonder and surprise, how long will the enlightened civilization and Christian sentiment of England endure this infamous traffic? It touches the national honour in a most direct way. It neutralizes to a large extent

the Evangelistic efforts of the Church both in India and China.

Opium-eating and opium-smoking are most pernicious and harmful. Not a few cases even in our Canadian asylums give proofs of its evil effects. But words fail to describe the mental, physical and moral degradation which is produced by indulgence in this evil habit in heathen lands. It is satisfactory to know that in England public opinion on this subject is being aroused as it never has been before. The late Archbishop of Canterbury made a strong protest to the British Government on the subject some weeks before his late illness. Meetings have been held in various parts of the country so as to thoroughly influence and educate the masses concerning the noxious traffic. An Anti-opium Society has been formed also, which, by circulating information upon the use and evil effects of opium, is doing a good work. Yet efforts are put forth in a counter direction. The quarterly magazines are utilized by various writers who point out that opium as a stimulant and narcotic has been in use among Asiatic nations from time immemorial, just as beer and spirits are consumed by Europeans. It is argued too that the Chinese Government is insincere in wishing the traffic to cease, as it is employing all diligence and effort to increase the growth and cultivation of native opium as a source of home revenue. The English people are appealed to, to resist an agitation on purely financial and economic grounds, which cannot for a moment be defended on moral grounds. Even ministers of the Crown have issued such *ad misericordiam* appeals. We believe not a single argument has been advanced in defence of the opium traffic, save the mercenary one, loss to the revenue of India. The evils produced in China by the use of the deadly narcotic are not mentioned.

The stupendous wrongs and crimes against humanity and against God, which the opium traffic must answer for are quietly passed by. Surely the English people have a right to ask that this revenue of fifty or sixty millions be raised in some other way? Surely the noble men and women in the English Church, who are doing such great things for the Missionary cause throughout the world ought to make their voice loudly heard in condemnation of this nefarious traffic? Surely they have a right to pronounce on a question of right or wrong; and if it is absolutely wrong, it not only deserves the attention of the Government, but it must have it, and immediate steps must be taken to redress the evil. It is a disgrace and a shame that a heathen people should be obliged to beg a Christian people to refrain from forcing upon them this dreadful drug. Though the whole revenue of India depended upon it, instead of a part only, and though China was about to grow the poppy in still greater quantities than she has imported it hitherto, our brethren across the seas must not hold their peace, but protest and protest, and agitate, until like slavery, the last vestiges of a vile and hideous traffic, which is paralyzing a people, and causing deadly suffering, is forever swept away, and the dark stain is removed from the proud banner of St. George.

Correspondence.

PERMANENT DIACONATE.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—The Provincial Synod in its last session enacted a Canon on the Diaconate (Canon XVIII) wherein it is laid down that "a Deacon need not surrender his worldly calling or business (such calling being approved by the Bishop) unless he be a candidate for the office of a Priest." For several reasons, which I need not go into, I thought the attempt to establish a permanent Diaconate was one of doubtful wisdom, and that, at any rate, the matter should be more fully considered in all its bearings, before the publication of a Canon. Perhaps I was wrong, and I trust I was, as the advocates for a Permanent Diaconate had it all their own way. But before the legislation has taken any wide effect, I would, with all deference, ask our Bishops and Priests to ponder the words

of one of the most thoughtful men of our day, the present Bishop of Durham. D. C. L.

Against this measure I have no objection to urge on principle. I do not see how I can find fault with the pursuit of secular avocations in the ministers of a Church whose chief apostle was a tent-maker. Precedents, too, in later ages are sufficiently frequent to justify this combination of the spiritual office with the secular work. But, waiving questions of ecclesiastical law of which the solution perhaps would not be very difficult, I foresee the possibility of grave administrative complications arising out of the creation of such a diaconate. It is intended, I suppose, that the ordering of these deacons should be regarded as indelible. A deacon once created is a deacon for life in the eye of the Church. He is permanently resident in the parish where he is called to minister. But the incumbent changes from time to time; and it is not difficult to see that complications may arise from this fact.

The removal of a deacon from his ministrations may set a whole parish on fire. The case of a curate presents no analogy, because he has not as a rule any domestic ties in the place, and he speedily departs to some other sphere of labour without serious inconvenience to himself. But a permanent deacon would remain as a focus of disaffection, if the elements of disaffection were there. The weight of parochial influence, in fact, has been transferred from the chief officer to his subordinate. Meanwhile, the deacon himself has a right to feel dissatisfied. He is invested with an office which he cannot shake off; and yet he is not allowed to perform the functions or to reap the advantages of his office. But, it will be said, this scheme for a permanent diaconate is, after all, only a restoration of the normal practice in the primitive Church; and we cannot do wrong if we follow this practice with an implicit faith as to the results. My answer is this. If you would remodel the Church organization after the primitive type, you must do so in all respects. If the diaconate in the primitive Church was permanent and localized, so was the presbyterate. If the primitive deacons maintained themselves by plying their trade or their business, so did the primitive priests. The curate, though only in deacon's orders, is much more valuable now to the incumbent than the layman, because spiritual ministrations are the main business of his life. But as soon as they cease to be this—as they would cease with these semi-secular deacons—it is reduced to a question of degree. Meanwhile the loss is serious. The most competent and conscientious laymen would probably object to being invested with a ministerial office which, involving grave responsibilities, would cling to them for life, no matter what may be the change in their external circumstances. Thus the field of choice would be limited. Meanwhile, if adopted as a substitute for the lay readership of which I spoke in a former part of my Charge—and this seems the view entertained by many of its supporters—it would involve another serious loss. The value of the lay readers's ministrations will consist to a large extent in the twofold fact that they are gratuitous and that they are not clerical. The one advantage probably, the other certainly, would be forfeited by the adoption of the permanent diaconate instead.

EASTER DAY.

(To the Editor of the Church Guardian.)

SIR,—On page 9 of one of your last issues you mention in an article, "Church Notes," that Easter Day "will fall earlier than it has at any time during the present century, viz.: on the 25th day of March." Let me refer your statician to the year A.D. 1818, and he will find that Easter *that* year fell on the 22nd of March, and in the last year of the past century, viz.: 1799, it fell on the 24th March, in 1796 on the 27th, in 1788 on the 23rd, and in 1780 on March 26th. In 1826 it fell on March 26th, and again the same date in 1837; in 1845 it fell on March 23rd; again in 1856 it fell on March 23rd; and therefore there have been three Easters, viz.: in A.D. 1818, in 1845, and in 1856,